Exhibit X

Explanation for those growing up without pervasive "*online*" and Google Inc or the very generation that built the interconnected **WIRES** encircling the Earth.

Yes; **WIRES** still required for "*online*" and Google Inc to continue to exist.

*** = Live PDF LINKS**

WIRES or LINES

Plaintiff/Appellant Curtis J. Neeley Jr. types and enters this exhibit because of appreciation of the prior generation's hard work but unrepentant refusal to accept determinations about "*online*" as honorable or worthy of respect when done by people (Article III judges) who grew up before this technology existed. This exhibit is done in order to help those who grew up without "*online*" or without [sic] "Internet" but who are now asked to decide how "*online*" or [sic] "Internet" will be treated (Article III judges). Governments world-wide invested an incredible amount of money and labor to distribute WIRES for use in communications. These physically interconnected WIRES were used by Plaintiff/Appellant's generation to create "*online*". Without these physically interconnected WIRES, "*online*" immediately ceases to exist. Radio can be used for Wi-Fi and is often ironically called "wireless" though wholly depending on WIRES to cross greater distance than reliably done by the radio medium.

"Wireless" is nothing but devices or apparatus translating signals from a WIRE to radio and from radio back to WIRE simultaneously. Many in Plaintiff/Appellant's generation once used Citizens Band radios to communicate between vehicles and these were ACTUALLY wireless communications but were not Wi-Fi.

In the late 90's near the interstate, hearing a female voice state, "drivers; got lonely ears on", on a Citizens Band radio immediately indicated the speaker was relatively nearby and the Citizens Band listener might then hear, "yes, this is 'JB' at the 65N Pilot, staying all night". This could allow the truck driver to communicate loneliness to a nearby female in the business of providing "companionship" to lonely truckers.

These ladies are often colloquially known as a "*lot lizards*" or "*hookers*". These were not personal communications but were made by wireless radio broadcasts the public could hear. This was why the "lonely" term was used and was why "JB" was used instead of personal names. There might be two to ten JB Hunt Inc. trucks at the Pilot station allowing the driver to avoid criminal charges for soliciting a prostitute.

Cellular telephones are and were often called wireless phones because the WIRES were not seen. The wire-radio interface occurred at the "cell tower". Calling another phone from the same physical location on another cellular telephone might involve fifteen miles of physical WIRE between two cell towers despite the phones being in the very same car.

In the formative years for Article III judges, there might be one interconnected WIRE causing attached phones to ring differently depending on the party desired. These were "party lines" where the same signal would be heard by all parties listening whether intended or not. The ability to use the same WIRE for two simultaneous conversations required the same type technology that resulted in "*online*" today. Integration of multiple signals into the same analog signal was how "*online*" began. Understanding this technology is far beyond the normally intelligent human mind but is now required to fully realize "*online*" has ALWAYS been the evolution of common carrier party-line telecommunications.

All cellular phones and every computer connected "*online*" receives the same "common carrier" communications data stream with a unique receiver identification assignment for each "phone number" or IP address. Cellular phones require continuous searching of the assigned frequency for their unique signal marker that either has data or does not continually. Cellular phones are always listening to their unique portion of the "common carrier" signal if turned on. Detection a "ring" signal alerts the telephone to notify the user of this reception or begin ringing. How this is done is far too complicated for the average highly intelligent person to understand but use of phones is trivial.

Gone are the formative years of Article III justices and days of switchboard operators like Sarah of Mayberry in the 1960s where dialog like, "Sarah, get me Mt. Pilot.", was Andy Griffith talking to the switchboard operator who might answer, "what number in Mt. Pilot can I help you with sheriff? Is this a sheriff-to-person call or a person-to-person call". This query about billing might lead to, "Why Sarah you know this is Andy and I am the sheriff and a person so I reckon it is both" which caused one of the first lessons in personal use of public telephone accounts. "Well Andy, if this is a call for your sheriff duties, the county pays. If you are sweet-talking Ellie, Helen, Mary, or Peggy, -Aunt Bee gets the bill and is going to want to know what was so important".

In this earlier time, WIRES making the connections had to be inserted into the corresponding jack on the switchboard that lit, signifying the call. This was all about interconnecting WIRES that are STILL required for signals to cross many hundreds of miles or travel across oceans.

These facts are now relevant because no "WHOLLY NEW MEDIUM"* will ever exist irrespective of the U.S. Supreme Court's factual error of *Reno v ACLU* in 1997. Laptop computers using Wi-Fi and sending communications overseas or retrieving communications from across the room or servers several hundred miles away are WIRE communications or communications by WIRE defined in 47 U.S.C. §153 ¶(59) now.

Wire communications was originally the first thing defined in the Communications Act of 1934 and has not changed at all and follows from back when it was more obvious that common carrier WIRES should be made safe because these WIRE communications were very often important distant communications in the days of telegraph WIRE communications.

> (a) "Wire communication" or "communication by wire" means the transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by aid of wire, cable, or other like connection between the points of origin and reception of such transmission, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) incidental to such transmission.

It is is obvious now and should have been obvious in 1997 that "*online*" or the interconnected network of WIRES ([sic]"Internet") has never been anything besides common carrier WIRE communications that once very much depended on interconnected WIRES physically networked to communicate data across greater distances than radio can communicate data beyond line-of-sight. [sic]"Internet" STILL **DEPENDS ON THESE WIRES TODAY**.

Current corporate desires to replace "old" copper WIRES for communications by distributed "wireless" digital communications is driven by the fact that communications are now distributed with seamless combinations of both the WIRE and radio mediums.

Fiber-optics greatly exceed the data volume capacities of copper WIRES. These new fiber-optics "WIRES" are physically distributed and then combined with radio interfaces like cellular phone towers or Wi-Fi routers to make the extremely expensive physical maintenance of the multitude of individual copper WIRES unnecessary within large physical areas where thousands of miles of old copper WIRES are now served by one tower.

Entirely radio-medium broadcast television signals in the days of Mayberry or the formative years of ALL Article III justices today are still used in some rural locations where costly WIRES never had enough users to justify or distribute the costs of installing these costly, labor-intensive physical WIRES and never will.

The conversion of the exclusively analog radio television signals into the digital television signals of today is the same process that would allow FM radio stations to sell both old-fashioned analog radio advertisements and Wi-Fi using the same frequencies licensed now without disturbing old radio reception.

There would need to be significant investment by these FM radio stations within their geographic FM signal areas to handle Wi-Fi back-haul by building what would effectively be large, distributed, "wireless" routers. Curtis J. Neeley Jr. can explain this further using wholly analog signals to transmit numerous data streams of digital data on one radio signal. This multichannel analog radio technology required a top-secret military security clearance in 1990 and this Plaintiff/Appellant's brain injury destroyed most experiential memories but left many of the facts learned. The USMC MOS of 2831 still requires a top-secret security clearance. Much of the "top-secret" 1990 technology may no longer be secret.

Still; This Plaintiff/Appellant will not describe more specifically how multichannel analog microwaves were used in 1990 to transmit numerous digital channels on one radio signal several hundred miles without being told specifically by the U.S. Attorney General's Office this may now be done. Few would understand this anyway without years of instructions.

The current complaint seeks redress for criminal violations of communications privacy laws protecting Title II common carrier WIRES. The WIRE communications above on p.5 were disguised as [sic] "Internet" by a culturally irrelevant SCOTUS in 1997 to support the status quo. SCOTUS became more irrelevant today with 4/9 justices six-plus years too old to remain active in most U.S. States and most free countries.

This Plaintiff/Appellant's generation is the generation where WIRES were first seamlessly combined with the radio medium. This simultaneous usage of two mediums was called some imaginary "[holy] *new medium*"* by a wholly confused generation of Article III judges who had absolutely no formative life experiences with [sic] "Internet". Plaintiff/Appellant's generation does not have formative life experiences with [sic] "Internet" compared to children this Plaintiff/Appellant seeks herein to protect from illegal "*obscene, indecent, or profane*"* radio broadcasting or transportation of "*obscene, lewd, lascivious, [...], picture*[s],[s] *film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character*".*

Because of a severe traumatic brain injury, this Plaintiff/Appellant encountered "*online*" initially as a highly educated human with advanced knowledge of WIRE communications and fine art photography but with no memory of any prior usage of either of these though lots of physical evidence of these both once remained.

This Plaintiff/Appellant had twenty-plus years experience creating naked photographs and attempted to justify continued usage of the naked human figure as an art object while recognizing these art objects were considered pornography by very many including both of Plaintiff/Appellant's parents. Because the Plaintiff/Appellant was an incompetent initially and not his own guardian, it was extremely important to keep display of new creations of naked art limited to adults to comply fully with U.S. law in order to continue creating naked art but not harm Plaintiff/Appellant's children.

This Plaintiff/Appellant began creating world-class art images of naked humans and sold these internationally by WIRE communications after displaying these at <photo.net> when this business required ALL viewership of these tagged naked images require authenticated membership and affirmations of legal age.

NameMedia Inc purchased <photo.net> after this Plaintiff/Appellant had begun using this electronic apparatus to market these newly created naked images. NameMedia Inc used <photo.net> to sell advertisements though requiring authentication for display of images tagged as naked. This safer process was quietly altered to display even tagged naked art in an immoral presentation to the general public per 18 U.S.C. §2511(2)(g)(i)* remaining today.

Ironically, Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren, Honorable Timothy L. Brooks, and Honorable Magistrate Erin L. Setser do not understand use of wire communications disguised as [sic] “Internet” even marginally while addressing usage of these unregulated WIRES to communicate original indecent visual creations ONLY to authenticated parties.

Honorable Timothy L. Brooks alleged plaintiff's usage of <deviantart.com> to display colored graphics to ONLY the authenticated still displays these to the general public allowing 18 U.S.C. §2511(2)(g)(i)* to be an excuse for Defendant/Appellee's criminal display of these. Honorable Timothy L. Brooks obviously predetermined a swift dismissal of this claim would occur after improper *ex parte* communications with Defendant/Appellee Google Inc counselors and began warping clear statutes to support dismissal just as Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren and the former law clerk Honorable Magistrate Erin L. Setser had already done.

This proceeding will always be dishonorable for the entire United States judicial branch regardless of outcome because the clear rule of law was not applied by United States District Courts when sought. Arkansas laws and U.S. laws were modified by judicial fiat such that Ark. Code Ann. 5-41-103* was mostly invalidated or judicially repealed and 18 U.S.C §2511* was misinterpreted to only protect contemporaneous communications though contemporaneous is not implied in this statute and all communications made by servers after authentications are contemporaneous to viewers if authentication is required and are contemporaneous even when criminally intercepted by Defendant/Appellees Google Inc and Microsoft Corporation though Microsoft Corporation now ceased many to mitigate damages awarded.

No unauthenticated general public party can see or describe the four primary colors used in the five graphics only contemporaneously communicated by viewing the Plaintiff Appellant's <deviantart.com> profile as alleged by Honorable Timothy L. Brooks without even looking in dishonorable Doc 22*.

See <curtisneeley.deviantart.com>* and know Honorable Timothy L. Brooks never looked before composing Doc 22* for the dishonorable swift dismissal planned *ex parte* with Defendant/Appellee Google Inc. See Doc 26-1 p.7*.

The unauthenticated general public see these ONLY by looking at the criminal interceptions done by Defendant/Appellee Google Inc like in submitted but "*stricken*" exhibits or see this crime live now via the following PDF links. <"curtis neeley site:deviantart.com">* or <curtis neeley>* or search at Defendant/Appellant Google Inc image search for this text if you can't just click.

The dishonorable $500 sanction or fine given by Honorable Timothy L Brooks to protect Defendant/Appellant Google for violating clear law is completely counter to U.S. law and makes use of the term "Honorable" writing this title/name herein absurd. The fine given to a pauper will remain ignored perpetually because breaking the law was ignored dishonorably. Laws ignored herein by a young judge after recommended by a law clerk appointed by an angry, culturally senile Article III judge to reward years of personal service. Angry Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren appointed his attractive law clerk that never once represented a private client before a judge. This angry, culturally senile Article III judge was accidentally offended once by this Plaintiff/Appellant describing an absurd prior ruling about WIRES to be indication of senility beginning.

Injustice(s) ALREADY DONE herein are like stating as follows:

> "Ninety miles-per-hour is speeding on any interstate regardless of the automobile being driven unless driven automatically by Defendant/Appellee Google Inc to save fuel. If this crime is done automatically by Defendant/Appellee Google Inc the United States Corts will twist laws and legal doctrines as might be necessary to protect the status quo."

This Plaintiff/Appellant will not file anything else to intentionally offend United States Corts because life is too short for tilting these windmills. Curtis J Neeley Jr should perhaps beg, plead, or pray for logic to be applied so two plus two is ALWAYS equal to four? Begging the "*American*" corts of today to rule morally is far below the morals and intellect of this severely brain damaged Plaintiff/Appellant.

The Federal Communications Commission made this entire dishonorable and immoral use of United States Corts a part of the publicly accessible record in the 14-28* proceeding and again in the 14-28* proceeding with live PDF links. The United States Corts can quietly not allow IFP appeal but this must be weighed like the Summary Misjudgment it will then be. The United States Corts will rule but this proceeding will be as impacting to humanity as Rev. Martin Luther's 95 Thesis from 1517. This disputation may take several years to be known by the public just like the 95 Thesis having little impact until translated from Latin and published in Germany years later.